



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,807	08/21/2003	Craig A. Rosen	PS735	7993

22195 7590 08/16/2005

HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT.
14200 SHADY GROVE ROAD
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850

EXAMINER

XIE, XIAOZHEN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/644,807	Applicant(s) ROSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Xiaozhen Xie	Art Unit 1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/21/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Sequence Rules

The instant application is not fully compliant with the sequence rules, 37 CFR 1.821-1,825, because claims 1, 3-4, 11 and 21-22 recite SEQ ID NO:X, SEQ ID NO:Y and ATCC Deposit NO:Z, which are not proper sequence identifiers. Compliance with the sequence rules is required.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-10, 14-15 and 21 are drawn to nucleic acids, vectors and host cells classified in class 435, subclass 69.1, for example.
- II. Claims 11-12 and 16 are drawn to polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350, for example.
- III. Claim 13 is drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1, for example.
- IV. Claim 23 is drawn to a binding partner to polypeptides, classified depending on structure feature of binding partners.
- V. Claim 17 is drawn to gene therapy, classified in class 514, subclass 44, for example.
- VI. Claim 18 is drawn to a method of diagnosis, comprising detection of a polynucleotide, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3, for example.

- VII. Claim 19 is drawn to a method of diagnosis, comprising detection of a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.
- VIII. Claim 20 is drawn to a method of identifying a binding partner using a polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350, for example.
- IX. Claim 22 is drawn to a method of identifying an activity using a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 375, for example.
- X. Claim 24 is drawn to a method for preventing, treating, or ameliorating a medical condition using a polypeptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-III are drawn to patentably distinct products, wherein each has a different structure and function which require separate searches, and wherein each is capable of separate manufacture and use.

The nucleic acids of Invention I are related to the polypeptides of Invention II by virtue of encoded the same. Although the DNA molecules and proteins are related since the DNA encodes the specifically claimed protein, they are distinct inventions because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities. Further, the protein product can be made by another and materially different process, such as by purification from the natural source, and the DNA may be used for processes other than the production of the protein, such as nucleic acid hybridization assay.

The nucleic acid of Invention I is distinct from and unrelated to the antibody of Invention III because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities which share neither structure nor function. Also, neither is required for the manufacture of the other.

The polypeptide of Invention II is related to the antibody of Invention III by virtue of being the cognate antigen, necessary for the production of the antibodies. Although the protein and antibody are related due to the necessary steric complementarity of the two, they are distinct inventions because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities. For instance, the polypeptide of Invention II is a single chain that functions as an enzyme, whereas the antibodies of Invention III including IgG comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementary determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus, the polypeptide of Invention II and the antibody of Invention III are structurally distinct molecule. Further, the polypeptide of Invention II is a large molecule which contains potentially hundreds of regions to which an antibody must bind, whereas the antibody of Invention III is defined in terms of its binding specificity to a small structure within the disclosed SEQ ID NO. Thus, immunization with the polypeptide of Invention II would result in the production of antibodies outside the scope of Invention III. Therefore, the polypeptide and antibody are patentably distinct.

The binding partner of Invention IV is distinct from and unrelated to each of Invention I-III because Invention IV recites no structure features and is physically and

Art Unit: 1646

functionally distinct chemical entities from Invention I-III. Also, neither is required for the manufacture of the other.

Invention I and each of Inventions V-VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different method. For instance, the nucleic acid of Invention I can be used for production of the protein.

Inventions I and each of Inventions VII-X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the product of Invention I is not used or otherwise involved in the process of Invention VII-X.

Inventions II and each of Inventions V-VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the product of Invention II is not used or otherwise involved in the process of Invention V-VI.

Invention II and each of Inventions VII-X are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another

Art Unit: 1646

materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different method. For instance, the polypeptide of Invention II can be used for cell culture medium addition.

Inventions III and each of Inventions V-VI and X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the product of Invention III is not used or otherwise involved in the process of Inventions V-VI and X.

Invention III and each of Inventions VII-IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different method. For instance, the antibody of Invention III can be used for affinity-purifying the protein.

Inventions IV and each of Inventions V-VII and IX-X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the product of Invention IV is not used or otherwise involved in the process of Inventions V-VII and IX-X.

Inventions IV and VIII are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as yeast two-hybridization.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions V-X are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Invention V requires search and consideration of gene therapy, Invention VI requires search and consideration of detecting a nucleic acid in a subject, Invention VII requires search and consideration of detecting a polypeptide in a subject, Invention VIII requires search and consideration of detecting protein binding *in vitro*, Invention IX requires search and consideration of detecting an activity to a polypeptide, and Invention X requires search and consideration of treating a medical condition using a polypeptide. Each search is not required by the others, and each method is divergent in materials and steps. Therefore, a search and examination of methods of Inventions V-X in one patent application would result in an undue burden,

since the searches for these methods are not co-extensive, the classification is different, and the subject matter is divergent.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and separate search requirement, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A. POLYNUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCES

Polynucleotide sequences of SEQ ID NO:X, where X may be any of the polynucleotide sequences disclosed in the sequence listing.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 is generic.

One species from the polynucleotide sequence group in Table 1A (fifth column) must be chosen to be fully responsive.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless

accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

B. POLYPEPTIDES

Polypeptides of SEQ ID NO:Y, where Y may be any of the polypeptides disclosed in the sequence listing.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 and 11 are generic.

One species from the polypeptide group in Table 1A (eleventh column)

must be chosen to be fully responsive.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

C. ATCC DEPOSITS

ATCC Deposit No:Z, where Z may be multiple different clones corresponding to

the same gene.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 and 11 are generic.

One cDNA clone ID from the ATCC Deposit in Table 1A (second and third columns) must be chosen to be fully responsive.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

D. SPECIES HOMOLOGUE OF SEQ ID NO:Y

Species homologues of SEQ ID NO:Y.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 and 11 are generic.

One species from the species homologues of SEQ ID NO:Y in claims 1 and 11 must be chosen to be fully responsive.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

Art Unit: 1646

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xiaozhen Xie, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-5569. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5.

Art Unit: 1646

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Xiaozhen Xie
August 9, 2005



**ELIZABETH KEMMERER
PRIMARY EXAMINER**